

James P. Walsh, CSB. No. 184620
 Gwen Fanger, CSB No. 191161
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
 San Francisco, California 94111-3611
 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
 budwalsh@dwt.com

Attorneys for Defendants and Claimant.
 BARRY COHEN, CHRIS COHEN (aka CHRISTENE COHEN), the F/V POINT LOMA and
 Claimant, F/V POINT LOMA Fishing Company, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DEL MAR SEAFOODS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARRY COHEN, CHRIS COHEN (aka
 CHRISTENE COHEN), *in personam* and,
 F/V POINT LOMA, Official Number
 515298, a 1968 steel-hulled, 126-gross ton,
 70.8 foot long fishing vessel, her engines,
 tackle, furniture apparel, etc., *in rem*, and
 Does 1-10,

Defendants.

No. C-07-2952-WHA

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE
 NO. 1 TO EXCLUDE PAROL
 EVIDENCE REGARDING AMOUNT
 OF DEBT UNDER PROMISSORY
 NOTE**

Final Pretrial Conf.: May 5, 2008

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor

This matter came before the Court on Defendants' Motion In Limine No. 1 to Exclude Parol Evidence Regarding Amount of Debt Under Promissory Note (the "Motion"). The Court, having considered Defendants' Motion, any opposition filed by Plaintiff, and all pleadings and other papers on file in this action and on such other evidence and argument as received by the Court hereby orders as follows:

Defendants' Motion is hereby GRANTED. Defendants signed a Promissory Note (the "Note") securing a loan made by Plaintiff with a mortgage on Defendants' fishing vessel, the F/V Point Loma. The parties agreed that the amount of the Note would be \$215,000. Plaintiff's

1 controller prepared the Note formalizing the agreement that expressly states that the Note is for
2 \$215,000. Plaintiff contends that at the time the Note was signed, Defendants owed
3 approximately \$237,000 that should have been covered by the Note. Nevertheless, the Note is
4 the final agreement of the parties as to the amount owed under the Note at the time it was signed.
5 The express terms of the Note state that the amount covered by the Note is \$215,000 and
6 therefore, the parol evidence rule bars any extrinsic evidence contradicting the amount of the
7 Note at the time it was signed. Accordingly, any evidence proffered by Plaintiff that the amount
8 of the Note should have been more than \$215,000 at the time it was signed is inadmissible.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10
11 DATED: _____
12
13

14 _____
15 William Alsup
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT CALIFORNIA
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28